LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 31 1961
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

October Term, 1961

No. 527

IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION

of

ROBERT V. RAFTER,

Appellant,

For an Order Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act,

against

D. HAYS, A. KELLEGREW,

Respondents,

AND

The HON. ARON STEUER, Justice of the Supreme Court,

Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

STATEMENT AS TO JURISDICTION

LODER APPEAL PRESS, INC., 41 VESEY STREET WOrth 2-0689

INDEX

	PAGE
Opinions Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Question Presented	3
Statement of the Case	3
The Facts	3
The Constitutional Question Presented	4
Conclusion	9
Appendix	11

CITATIONS

McNamara v. *Goldan*, 194 N. Y. 315 (1909)	5

TEXTS

Carmody-Wait, Cyclopedia of New York Practice, 1955 edition	5, 6
Poor's Register of Directors and Executives, 1955	8
Tax Law Review, Volume 13, January, 1958	9

STATUTES

PAGE

Civil Practice Act, Section 588(1), cited as added by the Laws of New York 1942, chapter 297 ..... 2, 3, 4

Civil Practice Act, Section 138(7), cited as added by the Laws of New York 1940, chapter 247 ..... 4, 6

Civil Practice Act, Section 1306, cited as added by the Laws of New York 1937, chapter 526 6

Internal Revenue Code, 1954, Section 883(1), 26 U. S. C. 883(1), c 736, 68 A. Stat. 283 8

Internal Revenue Code, 1939, Section 231(d) 8

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1961

In the Matter of the Application

of

ROBERT V. RAFTER,

Appellant,

For an Order Pursuant to Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act,

against

D. HAYS, A. KELLEGREW,

Respondents,

AND

The HON. ARON STEUER, Justice of the Supreme Court,

Appellee.

APPEAL FROM THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

STATEMENT AS TO JURISDICTION

The appellant, pursuant to the United States Supreme Court Rules 13(2) and 15, files this his statement of the basis upon which it is contended that the Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction on a direct appeal to review the final order rendered in this proceeding.

Opinions Below

No opinion was rendered by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

No opinion was rendered by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Jurisdiction

The appeal herein is from the final order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

This is a proceeding, pursuant to the provisions of Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act, to compel the signing of an order and to enjoin the obstruction of justice.

The final order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York appealed from was made and entered on February 23, 1961. Notice of Appeal was filed in the Court of Appeals of the State of New York on May 24, 1961.

The Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction to review by direct appeal the final order complained of by virtue of the provisions of Title 28, Sections 1257(2) and 2101(c) of the United States Code.

The statute of the State of New York involved is Section 588 of the Civil Practice Act, cited as added by the laws of New York 1942, Chapter 297. The particular subdivision of that section involved is subdivision 1, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

> Section 588. Appeal as of right.
>
> "Appeal to the Court of Appeals as of right lies only
>
> 1. from a judgment or order of the appellate division, provided that the judgment finally determine an action, or the order finally determine a special proceeding, and provided further that
>
> (a) there be directly involved the construction of the constitution of the state or of the United States;"

Question Presented

Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act governs hearings and procedure relating to a proceeding against a justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

Section 588 of the Civil Practice Act governs appeals to the Court of Appeals of the State of New York. Appellant's appeal was dismissed on motion, and appellant was ordered to pay costs.

The question presented is:

Whether appellant has been deprived of property without due process of law.

Statement of the Case

The appellant appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States from the final order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York entered in this proceeding in the office of the Clerk of the Court of Appeals the 23rd day of February, 1961, dismissing appellant's appeal from the order of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York in and for the First Judicial Department, entered the 29th day of November, 1960.

The Facts

The proceeding herein was commenced on the 22nd day of September, 1960, by the filing of a Petition in the Appellate Division in and for the First Judicial Department by the appellant (1) to compel respondent, the Honorable Aron Steuer, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, to sign an order, and (2) to enjoin the obstruction of justice by Hays and Kellegrew, respondents in the lower court, the Appellate Division (R. 22).

The Petition was duly served upon all respondents, returnable before the Appellate Division on the 4th day of October, 1960 (R. 18, 58 ,64, 70).

Neither Hays nor Kellegrew answered or appeared in the proceeding (R. 5).

The respondent, the Honorable Aron Steuer, appeared by the Honorable Louis K. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of the State of New York, and moved to dismiss the petition by notice of motion served by mail the 10th day of October, 1960, and returnable the 4th day of October, 1960 (R. 78, 81).

Appellant's Petition was unanimously dismissed by order of the Appellate Division entered November 29, 1960 (R. 7).

Appellant appealed to the Court of Appeals (R. 85) and noticed the appeal for argument for February 27, 1961, in accordance with the rules of preference, Civil Practice Act, Section 138(7), cited as added by the Laws of 1940, Chapter 247.

Respondent, the Honorable Aron Steuer, by motion returnable before the Court of Appeals February 20, 1961, moved to dismiss the appeal.

The Court of Appeals by order entered the 23rd day of February, 1961, dismissed the appeal.

From this order, the appellant now appeals to The Supreme Court of the United States.

The Constitutional Question Presented

I

The question presented is a constitutional one: the validity of Section 588, subdivision 1, of the Civil Practice Act *in its application to the proceeding herein.*

This federal question was raised by appellant and respondent in their respective affidavits before the Court of Appeals, appellant taking the position that Section 588 (1) has no application to the proceeding herein, *since this proceeding originated in the Appellate Division;* and respondent contending that Section 588 (1) has application and, absent a constitutional question, no appeal will lie.

The Court of Appeals upheld the statute and dismissed the appeal for want of a constitutional question.

Appellant contends that an appeal lies as of right, and the right to appeal is limited only where the court of first instance and the Appellate Division unanimously concur in the disposition of the action or proceeding.

In the case before us, however, there has been no unanimous concurrence by both the Appellate Division and the court of first instance, nor indeed could there be such concurrence since *the proceeding originated in the Appellate Division,* and hence the Appellate Division is the court of first instance.

Thus, in *McNamara* v. *Goldan,* 194 N. Y. 315 (1909), the question arose as to whether an appeal was properly before the Court of Appeals, though no leave to appeal had been granted. In allowing the appeal, the court held that the right to appeal is limited only where the court of first instance and the Appellate Division unanimously concur.

So also, Carmody-Wait, Volume 9, page 284, Section 39, states the law as follows:

> "The spirit and intention of the law is that where *both* the court of first instance and the Appellate Division unanimously concur in the disposition of an action or proceeding, an appeal shall

> not be taken to the Court of Appeals as a matter of right, *but that it is only in such a case that the right to appeal is limited.*"

There being no express provision in Article 78 for an appeal to the Court of Appeals, the general provisions of the Civil Practice Act apply.

> Civil Practice Act, Section 1306;
> Carmody-Wait, Vol. 22, page 558.

Additionally, Section 138 (7) of the Civil Practice Act does contemplate an Article 78 appeal to the Court of Appeals as follows:

> "Section 138. Preferences of certain civil causes in appellate courts.
>
> • • • • •
>
> 7. Where a proceeding has been instituted pursuant to article seventy-eight of this act against a justice of the supreme court, the cause in the discretion of the court, *or where an appeal therein is taken to the court of appeals,* in the discretion of that court, may be preferred over other causes."

This is a proceeding pursuant to Article 78—a *special proceeding* against a justice of the supreme court. This would seem to give rise to an *a fortiori* argument in favor of a *first appeal* as of right.

The petition asks merely that the justice *sign* the order (R. 29). This is a ministerial and routine duty (R. 49). The petition does not ask that the justice decide the motion. The motion was decided a long time ago (R. 25, 35).

In brief, petitioner's request is almost *de minimis.* Why, then, the opposition. Due process would seem to permit an appeal as of right.

II

A further constitutional question stems from the second part of the petition relating to the obstruction of justice (R. 27, 29). The precise nature of these acts is set forth in petitioner's affidavit in support of the petition (R. 50, 51), and further demonstrated by documentary proof set forth in petitioner's brief before the court of appeals, filed herein (Brief, p. 8).

The notice of appeal to The Supreme Court of the United States was filed May 24, 1961. Hays has *since* testified that *The Manufacturers Trust Company* of New York City referred the subject defendant, Mary T. Wilson, to Hays and that it was in this manner that Hays and Kellegrew came to represent her (Index No. 3221—1961, Supreme Court Westchester County). *The matter of this referral was posed by appellant upon direct examination of Hays on March 4, 1952. The Honorable Cornelius D. McNamara refused to permit inquiry* (R. 52; Brief p. 31, last six lines).

The question then arises as to why would the Manufacturers Trust Company want Hays to represent the defendant.

Hays is a member of the OSS, now the CIA, functioning under the Department of State and the National Security Agency (R. 53).

Appellant, during the pendency of the subject lawsuit, was engaged in negotiations for the sale or lease of tankers to the National Iranian Oil Company.

The Manufacturers Trust Company is a member of the Federal Reserve System, if not a national banking association.

Examination of the bank's board of directors indicates involvement with shipping and oil interests. For instance Admiral H. Flanigan, U. S. N., brother of the board chairman, is president, director or chairman of several corporations *engaged in chartering ships to oil companies* (Poor's Register, 1955).

In 1953 Appellant brought an anti-trust suit against certain named defendants *and others* (R. 52, Brief pp. 12, 39). After examination before trial of two witnesses and upon the scheduled date for examination of three others, appellant was removed from the field of action by governmental authority (Brief p. 12).

Thereafter, the Attorney General of the United States granted anti-trust immunity to the oil companies, and they and the government negotiated a settlement of the Iranian oil dispute, the oil companies obtaining a forty percent interest. It should also be stated that the Attorney General's law firm represents shipping interests, including the Admiral, U. S. N., aforementioned.

Appellant's purpose in negotiating with the National Iranian Oil Company was to demonstrate private enterprise as it exists in the United States by putting into effect a plan of his for the operation of ships in a tax exempt manner (I. R. C. Section 231 (d), 1939 Code, now Section 883, 1954 Code); a plan submitted by appellant to W. R. Grace & Co. in early 1946, the use of said plan forming the basis of the second cause of action in appellant's anti-trust suit, aforementioned, again directed at named defendants *and others.*

Possibly a further reason for obstructing appellant in his pursuit of life, liberty and happiness is the dearth of court decisions involving the shipping industry and the popularity among United States investors of foreign cor-

porate ownership of vessels which are chartered out rather than directly operated, including the entry of institutional investors and, indeed, the Maritime Adiministrator, into the foreign shipping field (Tax Law Review, Vol. 13, pp. 140, 148, 151 1958).

Perhaps the obstruction of justice outlined herein is a demonstration of political and corporate power; it also runs counter to our purpose to *establish justice* as announced in the preamble to The Constitution of the United States.

Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, Section 588, subdivision 1, of the Civil Practice Act would appear to be invalid for failure to afford due process within the meaning of Article the Fourteenth of the Constitution of the United States.

It is respectfully submitted that the Court may find this case an appropriate one for reversal without further argument.

The order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT V. RAFTER,
Attorney for Appellant, pro se,
Office & P. O. Address,
150 Broadway,
New York, New York.

State of New York
County of New York—ss.:

ROBERT V. RAFTER, being duly sworn deposes and says, that he is the attorney for the Appellant herein. That on the 20th day of July, 1961, he served the within jurisdictional statement upon Louis J. Lefkowitz, Attorney General of the State of New York by depositing a true copy of same securely enclosed in a post-paid wrapper in the United States Post Office located at Church and Vesey Streets, Borough of Manhattan, New York, directed to said Louis J. Lefkowitz, Esq., Attorney General of the State of New York at 80 Centre St., N. Y. 13, N. Y. that being the address within the state designated by him for that purpose upon the preceding papers in this proceeding, or the place where he then kept an office, between which places there then was and now is a regular communication by mail.

Deponent is over the age of twenty-one years.

ROBERT V. RAFTER

Sworn to before me this
20th day of July, 1961.

CARL P. RAGAZZO
Notary Public,
State of New York
Qualified in Queens County
No. 41-8482025
Cert. filed Queens Co. Clk's & Reg. Off.
Commission Expires March 30, 1962

APPENDIX

PAGE

Order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, Appealed From 12

Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act, Section 1306, cited as added by the Laws of New York 1937, chapter 526 14

Internal Revenue Code, 1939, Section 231(d) 14

Internal Revenue Code, 1954, Section 883(1) 14

Order of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, Appealed From

STATE OF NEW YORK,

IN COURT OF APPEALS

At a Court of Appeals for the State of New York, held at Court of Appeals Hall in the City of Albany on the Twenty-third day of February A. D. 1961.

Present,

HON. CHARLES S. DESMOND,
Chief Judge, presiding.

1 Mo. No. 142

In the Matter of the Application

of

ROBERT V. RAFTER,

Appellant,

For an Order &c.,

vs.

D. HAYS, and A. KELLEGREW,

Defendants,

AND

the HON. AARON STEUER, Justice of the Supreme Court,

Respondent.

A motion having heretofore been made upon the part of the respondent to dismiss the appeal taken by the

appellant in the above cause to this Court and papers having been submitted thereon and due deliberation having been thereupon had, it is

ORDERED, that the said motion be and the same hereby is granted and the appeal dismissed, with costs and ten dollars costs of motion, upon the ground that no substantial constitutional question is directly involved (§588, subd. 1, CPA).

A copy

GEARON KIMBALL
Deputy Clerk

Article 78 of the Civil Practice Act, Section 1306.

Section 1306. Applicability of provisions governing actions. Except as otherwise expressly or by plain implication prescribed by statute, the provisions of statute and rule applicable to practice or procedure in an action apply to the proceeding under this article so far as such provisions can be applied to its substance and subject matter without regard to its form. Cited as added by the Laws of New York, 1937, chapter 526.

Internal Revenue Code, 1939, Section 231(d)

Section 231. Tax on foreign corporations.

(d) Ships Under Foreign Flag.—The income of a foreign corporation, which consists exclusively of earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States, shall not be included in gross income and shall be exempt from taxation under this chapter.

Internal Revenue Code, 1954, Section 883(1)

Sec. 883. Exclusions from gross income.

The following items shall not be included in gross income of a foreign corporation, and shall be exempt from taxation under this subtitle:

(1) Ships under foreign flag.—Earnings derived from the operation of a ship or ships documented under the laws of a foreign country which grants an equivalent exemption to citizens of the United States and to corporations organized in the United States.

LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
NOV 14 1961

(3981)

Supreme Court of the United States

No. 387—October Term, 1961

ROBERT V. RAFTER,

Appellant,

against

THE HON. ABON STEUER, Justice of the Supreme Court,

Appellee.

On Appeal from the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

MOTION TO DISMISS FOR WANT OF JURISDICTION

LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ
Attorney General of the State
of New York
Attorney for Appellee
The Capitol
Albany 1, New York

PAYTON BLAIR
Solicitor General

JEAN M. COON
Assistant Attorney General
of Counsel

[illegible]
ALBANY, N. Y.